

## **BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

**December 19, 2006**

**7:30 PM**

Mayor Guinta called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll. There were fourteen Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Gatsas, Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil,  
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest

3. Presentation by Jane Beaulieu of the Bel Esprit Art and Cultural weekend festivities scheduled for September 2007.

Ms. Jane Beaulieu stated what we have are slides that are going to be presented during this short presentation of the last festival and I'd like to introduce Diane De Bonville who is the PR Director for the Manchester Artists Association which was a partner in this event this year which was called Bel Esprit.

Ms. Diane De Bonville stated I'm Publicity Chair and PR person for the Manchester Artists Association. Founded in 1966, 40 years ago, Manchester Artists Association is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing fellowship, education and incentive to artists with over 250 member of aspiring well-known artists and art supporters from the greater Manchester area we encourage one another and the public to develop a deeper appreciation of the arts. We offer a series of services to our members which includes monthly meetings and newsletters, a gallery artist of the month and artist of the year programs, a website, an on-line form, shows, lending library of art books and videos and a scholarship program for New Hampshire high school seniors. The Art in the Park Festival is part of Bel Esprit since last year is our largest show of the year with more than 60 participating artists and over a thousand visitors. To help defray our show's expenses we produce a booklet that lists exhibiting artists and participating sponsors. This booklet is given to all visitors of the show. This annual art show would not be possible without the support of community leaders like you. I would like to introduce you to the person responsible for this year's show...the person who will be the Chairperson for the Art in the Park 2007 and she's also the Vice President from the Manchester Artists Association Tiffany Frisella.

Ms. Tiffany Frisella stated what encourage us to come in front of you to give you a slide presentation and also a little bit of update of the festival this year was a press release that came out right after the festival probably a month later talking about how the City needs and Arts and Cultural Festival. Well, we do have a festival in this City and this is the fourth year. It started in 2003, the festival was called Riverfest for many years then we renamed it Mill City Festival merged with the Manchester Artists Association, Art in the Park and now the

festival is called Bel Esprit. It is downtown, it will be downtown in years to come and it is Veteran's Park and at Victory Park as well. This year we had several groups that were participating...we had the Manchester Community Music School, we had a Extreme Air Jump Rope competitors which were a nationwide recipients of awards, we also had entertainers...we had four different groups. We did collaborate with the New Hampshire Institute of Arts...they had their sidewalk Arts Festival. It was an unbelievable event. It has taken quite a few years to develop this event that is going to grow in the future. We did pass out some information a synopsis of what went on last year and wanted to thank you again for providing us funds to help us put the festival on. The CIP Committee gave us \$7,000, we raised \$6,000 to match it. Next year we'll be looking for assistance and will be twice as big as what it is and the Manchester Artists Association has been providing the community with a festival for the last 20 years, I believe. So, we'll continue to work together and again thank you very much.

Alderman Lopez stated questions came up during the public participation session that Alderman Osborne and other department heads will take care of the necessary complaints so that they know that somebody is going to address it. Will you agree to that Alderman?

Alderman Osborne replied I wouldn't call them complaints I would call them more concerns but anyway I will place it in my Committee (Public Safety and Traffic) and I can answer to all of those very clearly.



### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mayor Guinta advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

### **Accept BMA Minutes**

- A.** Minutes of meetings held on August 1, 2006 (two meetings); August 7, 2006 and August 8, 2006.

### **Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways**

- B.** PSNH Pole Petition #11-1132 located on Lincoln and Merrimack Streets;  
PSNH Pole Petition #11-1133 located on Belmont Street;  
PSNH Pole Petition #11-1134 located on Tessier Street;  
PSNH Pole Petition #11-1135 located on Larchmont Road; and  
PSNH Pole Petition #11-1136 located on Clay Street.

**Informational – to be Received and Filed**

- D.** Communication from Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager, providing information regarding the applicability of HB248 School Aid, with relation to the School Facility Improvement Project.
- E.** Minutes of a meeting of the Mayor’s Utility Coordinating Committee held on November 15, 2006.
- F.** Minutes of a meeting of the MTA Commission held on October 31, 2006 and the October 2006 Financial and Ridership Reports.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

- H.** Advising that it has approved a request from Grace Sullivan, MCTV Director, that video origination points be connected at the Emergency Operations Center and Health Department and that the Verizon and Ash Street School locations be changed to Memorial and West High Schools.

The Committee further notes that additional costs would be funded by the municipal Comcast cable grant.

*(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman DeVries who was absent.)*

**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC**

- J.** Recommending that regulations governing standing, stopping, parking and operations of vehicles be adopted and put into effect when duly advertised and posted.  
*(Unanimous vote)*

**HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O’NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN PINARD, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.**

- C.** Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning/Interim Director of Economic Development, providing an economic development update on activities as of December.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess I’m looking through this because I think as some of my colleagues may have watched the Planning Board meeting on Hackett Hill is there anybody here that can give us some insight on what’s happening with that project and what the problems might be.

Mayor Guinta asked Mr. MacKenzie are you prepared to do that at this time?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development and Interim Director of Economic Development, replied yes I can provide some information on that

because I did present to the Planning Board on the Hackett Hill Master Plan...that Master Plan has been adopted by this Board but under the Zoning Ordinance the Planning Board would also have to adopt it prior to issuing any subdivision or site plan approvals. I'm hopeful that the Planning Board will adopt that Master Plan the next time they meet. They did have a number of questions on the subdivision as proposed by the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority. They had determined it was a project of regional impact so staff had been working with the Town of Hooksett because a portion of the property where Hackett Hill goes by a portion of the property is actually under control of the Town of Hooksett. So, they have several comments. So, I'd be happy to answer any more specific questions.

Alderman Gatsas asked has there been any consideration of logging any of that area for revenue for the City?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I cannot answer that question...that would probably have to be answered by the Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Alderman Gatsas stated if there is revenue from a logging operation does it come to the City or does it stay with MHRA?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the revenues are going to the MHRA to be used for the future construction and improvements so that money...I think under current agreements they would be MHRA for road improvements, etc.

Alderman Gatsas asked is logging part of that agreement or is that something else because I think there's certainly a lot of land in this City that if we started looking at a revenue source that that may be one alternative use for doing some logging in a very systematic way that I think might create some revenue in the City and that may be one spot to look. So, is there any way we can get a report, your Honor, because my understanding is there's an awful lot of revenue that can be found through the logging scenario. So, whether Finance goes out and measures trees to find out if we can get somebody to go out and do an independent but it would be interesting to see how much revenue we could find from that source?

Alderman Forest stated I'm not sure. I don't think there's anything in the contract about logging but I think the majority of the area because it's already been paved and everything else there wouldn't be much logging and the logging that would be done up there is for endangered trees and I don't think we'd want to be delving in that. I know there's some trees that need to be cut in the development and all but I don't think there's a major logging industry in that area. I think there's a lot of people in the area that will be pretty upset with that.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm not an expert and I agree with you so I would say that maybe we find an expert to tell us if there is revenue in the City because I know that Water Works have generated revenue by doing a systematic logging or cutting of trees on Water Works land and that's probably what brought it to mind.

Mayor Guinta stated why don't we put a staff committee together to look into it and get back to us at the next BMA meeting. I think that would be appropriate.

Alderman O'Neil asked would it be possible that that same committee...I happened to watch some of the Planning Board meeting...they had a couple of major projects...it was a long night for them. I'm not even sure what all of the issues are...that meeting did not go very well from what I saw. Can we get a list of what all the issues are that the Planning Board wants back before they meet with the Planning Board again.

Mayor Guinta asked do you know when the next Planning Board meeting is?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the next Planning Board meeting will not be until the second Thursday in January.

Mayor Guinta stated the next time the BMA meets is the first Tuesday in January...January 2<sup>nd</sup>. Can we get a response to Alderman O'Neil and the full Board by that time.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated on all the issues because it was all over the place...from a major traffic study...it was quite involved. Thank you, your Honor.

Alderman DeVries stated while we are receiving the materials if my recollection is correct during the meeting there were issues with Lots 8 & 9 for the sensitive species and questioning whether or not activities on that lot were directly draining into the protected watershed areas. If I understood during the meeting you were going to be providing some sort of topographic relay so they could get a better sense of the sensitive areas and provide that to us as well if you would so we can visualize the water shed being protected up there and specifically through Lots 8 and 9.

Alderman Lopez stated the timeframe we're looking at...we approved the Master Plan and it went to the Planning Board and the Planning Board has been working on the Master Plan for quite a while and it seems like we're going backwards. But, the timeframe for that particular area for redevelopment...is there a way that the Planning Board can address this at a special meeting because that's the number one priority up there?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Planning Board can hold special meetings but they have asked for certain information that will take a little bit of time to prepare. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen could ask them to hold a special meeting but it won't be helpful unless that information is prepared.

Alderman Lopez asked what do you think from the experience how long that is going to be...will that go into February?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the biggest, most time consuming item that they requested and I did try to keep notes as to all issues they raised...the biggest issue probably was a full traffic study and that can sometimes taken four to six weeks to accomplish.

Alderman Shea stated this has nothing to do with that in particular but I do want to compliment Bob MacKenzie on giving to Board members an economic development update. This is something that are sorely lacking, in my opinion, prior to bob taking over and he has listed for all of us all of the projects that are on-going and I think it really brings us at least from this perspective some idea of what is going on and the magnitude that's involved in his work as Economic Development Director or Interim Director and I want to compliment Bob on that...that's what I had in mind, your Honor, when I did bring up this other committee but obviously he has updated everyone and I think that he's to be commended for that.

Mayor Guinta stated the one thing I would add to that that part of the job description of the Economic Development Director is to provide the specific updates to this Board. I actually checked it myself with Ms. Lamberton so as a matter of policy moving forward because there is a requirement authorized by this Board that we will be demanding that from Bob and whoever his replacement will be.

Alderman Shea stated at this time he seems to be well versed in both areas because being part of the Planning Board/Director and also intertwining with this he's weaving a very fine path for us. Thank you.

Alderman Forest stated I just want to comment. I was at that Planning Board meeting, I did advise some of my colleagues about it but apparently I was the only one that showed up as far as the Board. There were a lot of concerns and questions addressed by residents in the area and of course the Sierra Club was there, there were some concerns addressed by the Town of Hooksett and the Planning Board in their wisdom kept the comments and part of their meeting open until they get these concerns addressed. There were concerns by a small condo association about the fact that they were land locked...that's going to be addressed. There were a lot of questions asked and I think the Master Plan for Hackett Hill was addressed in a fairly great manner and I think these concerns are going to be addressed before the Planning Board issues the okay. I was a little disappointed that they didn't go ahead with allowing them to follow-up on it. I think it probably delays it another two or

three months but in their wisdom they kept it open until they got their concerns answered and I think they'll be addressed in January.

Alderman Roy stated I'd like to mirror the accolades we're giving Mr. MacKenzie he is setting the bar quite high for whoever is going to follow and get that position but I'd move to receive and file Item C. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Long stated I'm the Aldermanic Representative on the Planning Board, I was there that night and I'm not sure if there's an avenue with which we could carve out...there's three lots that are in the SEP agreement that are at issue and the Planning Board from my perspective are a group of dedicated volunteers...I've never seen an intelligent City concerned group of people that brought out some legitimate concerns. Now, I'm not sure but maybe Mr. MacKenzie can answer this is whether or not we could carve out those three lots and accept the lots that weren't under the SEP agreement.

Mr. MacKenzie stated while it was recognized for example by the Nature Conservancy that those were sensitive lots. The Nature Conservancy was part of the agreement that we reached with the federal EPA and the state saying that those lots could be developed. Basically, the agreement was that they had to be developed sensitively and make sure there was no impact. I think if those guidelines aren't followed those lots can be developed but again the Planning Board is being careful that they should be shown on the subdivision plan. The Board does have the option I think to request that those lots be cut out of the subdivision but I'm not convinced that those pose any threat to the Nature Conservancy Preserve.

Alderman Gatsas stated I just had a quick conversation with Mr. MacKenzie and I've gotten an awful lot of calls from people in that area talking about the traffic problems that might be created on Wellington Hill and I guess my concern is the current zoning versus the possible zoning and almost doubling the number of units in that area so I think that we ought to take a legitimate concern about the traffic that's on Wellington Hill now before we move too far ahead on this project.

Alderman DeVries stated one final question if I might from Mr. MacKenzie. If I understood during that meeting since the agreements were drawn up with the Nature Conservancy they have located an additional white cedar swamp, a protected area that was not part of the original agreement and if I understood the discussion that night from the Nature Conservancy that might have been part of their concern that there are additional areas that if they had been identified in the initial inventory it would have been protected as part of their plan and I think that's why it has risen to a higher order for discussion on how we as a City would protect those species that are part of the ecosystem up there and necessary to continuing the properties we have already invested into. So, I think that's why we asked for the additional information to be advised as well as the Planning Board members.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion to receive and file. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**G. Appropriating Resolution:**

“Amending a ‘Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$52,321,042 to \$57,321,042 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year 2007’.”

Mr. Randy Sherman, Interim Finance Officer, stated I asked the Mayor to pull this off the agenda...I just wanted the Board to be aware that this is a supplemental appropriation that the Airport is asking for under Section 6.05 of the City Charter. In order for you to adopt a supplemental appropriation we must certify that these revenues do indeed exist. I wanted to inform the Board at this point that the entire \$5 million is not in-hand at this point. We’ve received \$3.7 million, we have a letter from the FAA that the other \$1.3 million should be in by January 8<sup>th</sup>. So, what we’re asking is that we set the public hearing as required by the Charter. If funds have been received by January 2<sup>nd</sup> we can proceed on that evening other than that we will have to let it sit on the table until the second meeting in January. But, I just wanted to inform the Board of that.

Alderman Roy stated I noticed Mr. Farren is here...quick question...does this set you back in any projects, does it restrict you, are you okay with what the Interim Finance Director just mentioned?

Mr. Mike Farren, Assistant Airport Director for Finance and Administration, replied we’re fine with it. What this is is an FAA grant fully intending to pay down part of our bonds and we’ve been doing this for the last two or three years...just late in arriving. We had programmed it to be for fiscal year 2006 and it didn’t all come in in 2006.

Alderman DeVries stated so with this appropriation we are not encumbered for any sort of dispensation that the federal government has not yet budgeted.

Mr. Farren replied no. We’re fine with it. They programmed starting in 2001 \$53 million and we used that promise, Letter of Intent, to have seven annual payments...this is the sixth, the seventh will come next year.

Alderman Garrity moved that the Resolution be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**Report of the Committee on Lands and Buildings**

- I.** Recommending that a request of Verizon Wireless to exercise their lease option on the communication tower located at Derryfield Park through the year 2015 be granted and approved as enclosed herein and further that the Mayor be authorized to execute same for and on behalf of the City subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

*(Unanimous vote)*



Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my question is the revenue from this project...where does the revenue go, does it come to the City or does it go to the Fire Department?

City Solicitor Clark replied it goes to the Water Works.

Alderman Gatsas asked who owns the land?

City Solicitor Clark replied the land is under the jurisdiction of the Manchester Water Works it's by the reservoirs on top of Derryfield hill.

Mayor Guinta asked does the Water Commission have to confirm this?

City Solicitor Clark replied they've already voted on it.

Mayor Guinta stated but it does require City approval.

City Solicitor Clark stated yes.

Alderman Duval moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Lands and Buildings. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

5. Mayor Guinta presented the following nominations pursuant to Section 3.14 of the City Charter:

**Heritage Commission:**

Derek M. Dufresne to succeed Linda S. Seabury (term Limit) , term to expire January 1, 2010.

**Office of Youth Services Advisory Board:**

Peter Favreau to succeed himself , term to expire January 1, 2010;  
Brother Paul Crawford to succeed himself, term to expire January 1, 2010;  
Ashley Pratte to succeed herself, term to expire January 1, 2010; and  
Wade Reck to succeed Rev. Christopher Emerson, term to expire January 1, 2010.

Pursuant to Rule 20 of the Board these nominations will layover to the next meeting.

6. Confirmation of nominations to the Arts Commission as follows:  
Jeanine Tousignant to succeed Richard Maynard, term to expire December 1, 2009; and  
Elizabeth Cash Hitchcock to succeed Al. St. Cyr, term to expire December 1, 2007.

On motion of Alderman Duval, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to confirm the nominations to the Arts Commission as presented.

7. Confirmation of nominations to the Water Works Commission as follows:  
Dylan R. Cruess to succeed Donald Couturier, term to expire January 2010;  
and  
William A. Beaton to succeed James W. Craig, term to expire January 2010.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to confirm the nominations to the Water Works Commission as presented.

Alderman Lopez asked is there some procedure in place...I've had some phone calls...when people are being replaced will somebody in your office let the individual know that he is not going to be nominated before somebody else is nominated.

Mayor Guinta stated I believe we do speak with the individuals but if there's a specific issue or concern we can certainly address it.

Alderman Lopez stated the concern I had is the Manchester Housing Authority, which is your appointment. I've had some feedback that the person wasn't informed of being replaced...would you look into that, please. You appointed Marion McMillan to succeed Marie Donohoe and I had some feedback in reference that she was not informed...just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Mayor Guinta stated thank you.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to me.

Mayor Guinta called the meeting back to order.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

10. A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending that Supplemental Appropriating Resolution:

“Amending a ‘Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$52,321,042 to \$57,321,042 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year 2007’.”

be referred to a public hearing on Tuesday, January 2, 2007 at 6:30 PM in the Aldermanic Chambers of City Hall.

Alderman Pinard moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Finance. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- 11.** Updates requested by Alderman Roy as follows:
- a) Crime Prevention measures including:
    - K-9 (specifically policy on drug dogs)
    - Manpower
    - Special Reserves
    - National Advertising
  - b) Net Team results/recommendations; and
  - c) status of vacancy savings

Alderman Roy stated I noticed the Chief is with us, Police is with us this evening possibly to discuss manpower, special reserves and national advertising. His Deputies have been working on K-9 procedures and I think we'll get an update in January on that...if there is anything else the Chief would like to update us on.

Police Chief Jaskolka stated I believe your first question was on K-9's and we're working on that and I believe that Deputy Lussier is in the process of putting a proposal together. What I can tell you is that our complement right now is nine canines. We've taken four off the road...three for the age of the dog itself and age and injury to the dog because the handler injured his knee and can't keep up with the rigors of handling a canine. One of the canine officers who did retire his police dog has on his own has trained that dog as a drug dog so we have four working police dogs and one drug dog and that dog will eventually be trained as a police dog and then we'll add the additional officers as time moves on...that's a proposal that Deputy Lussier will bring to you. With regard to manpower vacancies we have a January 8<sup>th</sup> test scheduled. Right now, the number we got from HR is we have 120 candidates that have paid to take the test. There are a few other stragglers...I believe HR is going to order 130 tests just to be sure. Out of that we hope to get a good number of people. We also have 8 to 10 certified police officers who have applied with us...9 of those are in the background process right now. The anticipated hire date is March 4<sup>th</sup>, however, if we get a good group of pre-certified candidates we'll probably have a hiring date before then...have those officers on the street by spring and then have this current group...the January testing group on the street by summer with another test scheduled for May and that's when we're going to put the push on the college students and we'll put in the new advertising program. We've already come up with some new posters and we'll be working on some ideas in regard to advertising.

Alderman Roy in reference to the 13 vacancies stated just by doing the math that's off the 215 number.

Chief Jaskolka stated that would be off the 215 number yes.

Alderman Roy stated that's what you were funded in your budget for.

Chief Jaskolka stated no. The budget is at 205.

Alderman Roy stated so the budget itself that was passed had a complement of 205 so the 13 is off of the 205 number.

Chief Jaskolka stated the 13 is the anticipated approval for a budget for 215. I would estimate with the numbers that we have that I could probably out of that group hire enough to get us to 218 or at least have some people available should somebody else retire between now and then.

Alderman Roy asked could you possibly for our next meeting in January or our second meeting in January let us know what type of dollars you'd be looking for to fund that complement of 218 so we can start working on that with you?

Chief Jaskolka replied yes I can.

Alderman Gatsas stated back to the canines...right now, we have no drug canines on the force at all.

Chief Jaskolka replied we have one.

Alderman Gatsas stated we have one.

Chief Jaskolka stated that's the officer that obtained the dog on his own and did the training on his own in Boston.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many should a community this size have?

Chief Jaskolka replied I'd like to say there'd be one available for each shift. In order to have one available all the time you'd almost have to have six drug trained canines understanding that the training time for a police dog is 11 weeks and I believe a drug dog is an additional 11 weeks...so it's 22 weeks of training to cross train the dogs.

Alderman Gatsas stated once we have these dogs in place is there any way that these dogs can do drug testing in the schools.

Chief Jaskolka stated yes. The last time around we worked with the School Department, we've established a policy that allows us to do that...that's something that come next semester we should be able to do with the current drug dog that we have.

Alderman Gatsas stated I happened to see one down in Hudson, they did it and normally what they do down there is they actually have two dogs so that when the first dog makes the

initial hit that's it's confirmed with the next drug sniffing dog so that there is a reason to take a look in that locker.

Chief Jaskolka stated that may be a policy that they have. What we would do if we were to do searches we'd probably request State Police and a drug canine...the dogs tire pretty quickly when they're doing those types of searches so it would be best to have two dogs in the school.

Alderman DeVries stated you had just mentioned that you would like to increase the complement to 218 or you possibly could increase the complement to 218 with the hire of certified police officers already trained in the candidates. Do you need this Board to take any action to move that process along this evening or are you planning to do that under your over/under policy of floating personnel?

Chief Jaskolka replied I don't think it's something we need to look at tonight. Right now, we're looking at the certified people. We have up to about 15, we have 9 in the process right now which history tells me we'll probably hire 4. Usually with certified people it's just below the halfway mark of what we're looking at. With 120 people normally we'll get 12 out of that. So, those numbers if we were to hire everybody and nobody leaves between now and then we would have 218 people available. If we cut off at 215 we can hold them...the only problem with that is if they're testing with Manchester we know they're probably testing with State Police, Nashua, Concord and they could be testing in other states also. So, if they make it through our test pretty much is willing to hire them.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess that's exactly to my point. If we need to authorize for the additional hires so that you don't lose fully-qualified candidates that you wish to keep because that's been somewhat problematic for you. Are you going to come back to this Board and ask us to suspend the rules to move that process along or?

Chief Jaskolka replied I believe that was Alderman Roy's request and I will come back in January with what the figures would be.

Alderman Lopez stated just to follow up on the, Chief. You're talking about the police officers...are you talking about the whole picture...do you need anymore police vehicles, weapons, all that is going to be part of your report.

Chief Jaskolka stated the report's going to include all the equipment to outfit the police officers. It will be their uniforms, their leather gear, weapons and radios.

Alderman Lopez asked what about space for all of the police officers...we talked about a substation on the west side...have you had any discussions along that line?

Chief Jaskolka replied I know that Community Policing's Sgt. Kevin Kincaid's been talking to people on the west side...the space in our building we're pretty much taxed out...we have nothing left. We have lockers in places that lockers don't belong but basically we're out of space for people.

Alderman Lopez stated that is going to be part of your report too.

Chief Jaskolka stated yes.

Alderman Shea asked how many people do you actually have now on the force?

Chief Jaskolka replied right now we have 202 sworn personnel.

Alderman Shea asked do you anticipate any retirements or do they come unexpectedly because of job opportunities that officers might receive?

Chief Jaskolka replied I'm not aware of any right now. Usually, I have some idea that something's coming up. The majority of the retirements we had this year I was aware of well before they occurred. I have not been told of anybody who's retiring in the very near future. I do expect some retirements I just don't know who they're going to be or when they're going to go.

Alderman Shea asked can you give a slight update as far as what's going on within the City in terms of reassuring the citizens that crime is being handled appropriately by your department in all aspects. Is there more crime, less crime, about the same kind...are bad guys running around?

Chief Jaskolka stated I can tell you in general and you probably read the FBI's crime report. As I've said before we look at our percentages and unfortunately our percentages look high because the numbers are low. We may have 20 more particular crimes at this time of year...say you get 80 to 110 crimes...are we happy with it...absolutely not but we're looking at an increase of 20 crimes over a population of somewhere around 115,000 people. So, we stay on top of that. We look at crime statistics on a monthly basis...they're published within the department, we look at calls for service on a weekly basis. We get a report...that all comes out on the Wednesday afternoon preventative policing meeting where all the section heads come together and discuss what's going on and then that's when the strategy for the following week is actually planned but this is so that we stay proactive as opposed to being reactive...there's still a lot of reactive work. I can tell you this week the last three or four weeks we've been averaging 250+ calls for service a day. The summaries in this past week we went up to 280 for service per day at a time when it should be slowing down. I fully expect this weekend and next weekend to be busy. I'm kind of anxious to see where the calls are going to go come the beginning of January when everybody kind of goes back in

the house and see if things slow down and then we can kind of get caught up on some of the stuff we hadn't done. We're staying as proactive as we possibly can through the preventative policing meetings and watching the crime statistics. We work with State Police, we have an on-going initiative right now. We work with the FBI, DEA and we have an ATE agent assigned to our building and is there five days a week...basically, works a 40-hour week out of our building.

Alderman Shea stated I read that and cut that out of the paper because one part of that particular FBI report interested me and that was that they were going to present causes as to why crimes were being committed and submit that and I'm kind of harping on that and I think that I'm still not through with that of course but I think that that report as far as the causes of crime would be directly helpful not only to your department but also to any department within the state here where crimes are being perpetrated and why they're being perpetrated. One last question...I want to go back...you mention that you have 202 personnel...how many employees other than police officers constitute that 202 complement that you have.

Chief Jaskolka asked you're talking civilian personnel?

Alderman Shea replied yes.

Chief Jaskolka stated I think the department complement is about 275.

Alderman Shea stated so when you gave me the 202 figure that was simply...

Chief Jaskolka stated 202 was just sworn officers...that's from my position down to first-week patrolmen.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there anything on this list whether it's for K-9's, manpower, special reserves, national advertising...Alderman Lopez asked about vehicles. Is there anything we need to start planning for in the next month or two...most likely financial?

Chief Jaskolka replied financially...obviously, the budget if we're going to go forward with the hiring. Secondly, uniform costs to outfit the people as they come on. At one point we're probably going to need to increase the amount of patrol cars that we have. Obviously, we still have people out on bicycles...they will at one point very shortly be coming off the bikes but the people of those details we sometimes have to tell them they can't ride their bikes because there's six feet of snow out there but they like it, it's a great detail. Obviously, I'd like to put out more bikes...part of my plan also is to add to the...with the next hiring...in January the School Resource Officers will go back to the schools but as soon as the nine people we have in the field training officer program right now that just came back from the

academy and hit the street I was going to try to put two more people in the Community Policing Unit.

Alderman O'Neil stated the information that will be forwarded to us or discussed a month from now approximately...will that include requests for necessary funding?

Chief Jaskolka replied what we will do is put together an entire packet of what we'll need for finances as far as personnel itself, equipment and then we'll look at the fleet.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would encourage you to come back and ask us and we'll do our best to provide.

Chief Jaskolka stated I need to see what the numbers we're going to get out of the January test. I'm expecting if history holds true we're probably going to hire 12 people out of that test.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm guessing to get the K-9 numbers whether they're just patrolled trained or drug trained you're going to have to make a commitment as to manpower going away for a period of time...they're going to be a cost for that.

Chief Jaskolka stated that's going to be a part of the proposal that Deputy Lussier is putting together right now.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I recall of all nights for it to happen I think you had an incident in west Manchester the guy was on the roof at one point and he was going to blow up the building and it just happened to be the night and the shift there were no dogs available in the City and you had to wait for the State Police to respond which is highly unusual in the City of Manchester.

Chief Jaskolka stated I believe that night we did have the State Police K-9 that's been assigned to us.

Alderman O'Neil stated it just happened to be here. I know traditionally you've always tried to have three dogs available per shift...if there's a night off there's at least usually two dogs available.

Alderman DeVries stated I think it was a little earlier in the fall last year when we instituted the jeep patrol and it was somewhat of a response to concerns that I had in the late fall...Christmas season obviously there's a greater increase in the shoplifting and other activities at the mall and on South Willow Street and it's difficult for the sector officers to stay patrolling in the south end of Manchester because they're constantly diverted to the Mall of NH. During the course of the summer I think in response to our other hot jobs the jeep



patrol was kind of reappropriated or reallocated to other issues and I'm wondering if you've found a way to deal so that there is actually patrol happening in the south end of Manchester in addition to what goes on at the Mall of NH or on South Willow Street.

Chief Jaskolka stated short of telling you operationally how I'm going to do it I will have some manpower to do that but to say exactly where that manpower is going to come from is operational and as you know I don't discuss operations. I will have some personnel.

Alderman DeVries stated I understand that and I guess you can take it as a generalized comment that I'm receiving more phone calls of it being hard to get a response and frequently that has been the case this time of year so if there's a way to help with that it would be appreciated.

Chief Jaskolka stated I believe I'm going to be able to do that through the personnel on that shift.

Mayor Guinta asked are there any other questions.

Alderman Shea stated I have a question of Matt. Matt, I want to compliment you on your untiring efforts to clean up the City. This goes hand-in-hand with what the third speaker said this evening who presented quite a bit but as we look through all these items...trash and junk (43), abandoned property (23), drugs of course is there but that's eight and life safety (22) and then I look down at obviously my ward which I've been badgering you about but the point of the matter is I think people listening have to understand that the process is not like an overnight kind of situation and I think that they have to realize that there are certain problems attached to all of the concerns here and I think that they have to be addressed in not only one way but in a multitude of ways in terms of trying to handle these because he mentioned ordinances that we have to strengthen but also different types of pressure has to be brought in other ways in order to either protect the landlords that are very accountable and very responsible as he seemed to be and I know others that are and we do tend to say that there's a lot of absent property owners but there's a lot of responsible property owners and I've gone by buildings in my ward where landlords have improved the properties and then the windows are open, the doors are open and there's trash and people walk out and we say there's kind of like an absentee landlord but it isn't an absentee landlord it's tenants that are neglecting to do. So, I don't know if you could comment on your work and how you're trying to handle that.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated I think that leads to the effectiveness of the Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET) because the many departments that are involved can attack the same issue a lot of times in different directions applicable to their code and what they can enforce whereas just one inspector from one department of a given day going to a property maybe that inspector can't deal with the entire issue so it's been fairly effective so far.

We've received 80 complaints that are qualified complaints. Oftentimes we'll get numerous complaints through the website on the same address. Right now, we're down to just 20 that have not had any initial investigation and that more than half of those will be dealt with in the next seven days. There are 26 of those 80 that there are on-going efforts to bring them into full compliance...second and third inspections, pending litigation through the courts and then 34 of those 80 have been completely resolved. As you mentioned a lot of these complaints deal with many different types of offenses...one complaint could involve drugs, life safety and trash. The reason why that drug number is so low is naturally because complainants report that to the Police Department. It just that some of these have come in through the website. Eight of the 80 have involved drugs, life safety has 22 of those complaints have been involved...trash and junk complaints are huge...that's over half of the complaints that we get. There's been 12 illegal business complaints. Twenty-three abandoned properties...another issue that's really kind of coming into focus now is abandoned vehicles throughout the City...there's hundreds and that's something that I think the City is going to have to look at down the road...if there's a better way to deal with that. We've had separate homeless sites that have been dealt with and then we've had some other complaints that have involved animals...dogs, cats. I provided a list of the distribution I didn't know if the Aldermen would be interested to know how many complaints we've received for their particular ward. As far as recommendations go Alderman Roy had asked for recommendations...I know the Mayor's office is working with Dennis Hebert on identifying grants that are available that may have monies available for NET. I know there were eight grants that were identified...I don't know what the status of that is but I think as a group and as I said earlier the number one concern is trash and junk in the City and then the other issue obviously are zoning violations and I think the Board has rectified that and the Mayor's office by filling that position and I know Leon's working on that. The other one is the Garbage Compliance Officer through the Highway Department I don't know that that's been funded but it may be possible that grants are available to fund that position where the City could dedicate somebody to actually go out and deal with all the trash complaints but also be proactive in dealing with those because as you saw tonight we just got another 11 complaints just on the west side that NeighborWorks brought in so trash is certainly a primary concern right now for residents.

Alderman Shea stated I'm not sure if Leon can answer this but has that particular job been filled or is it still in the process of being filled.

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Building Commissioner, stated I believe the position that you're referring to is the position that was vacant in our office that the Board and the Mayor and provided authorization to fill as opposed to the new position that has been discussed at the Board level but has not yet made it to the status of an approved position. The position that we do have approval to fill is an existing position. We finished a recruitment process and we hope extend a job offer by the end of this week to bring somebody on Board for the first of the year.

Alderman Shea stated so that is the one that was allocated in the budget but was not filled.

Mr. LaFreniere stated that was the position for which we were not fully funded in the budget but it was an existing position.

Alderman Shea stated you were then given additional funding by the Mayor's authorization about a month or six weeks ago and now you're saying it's going to be filled in January.

Mr. LaFreniere stated we were given approval to fill the position. I have talked with the Finance Officer about earmarking contingency funds to make up the shortfall necessary to financially address the position requirements and I anticipate that we're going to have somebody on board in that position within two weeks.

Alderman Shea stated so you have interviewed people.

Mr. LaFreniere stated we have concluded our interview process, we're checking references right now and hope to extend an offer by the end of the week.

Alderman Shea stated that person will help Glenn Gagne as well as work with Matt.

Mr. LaFreniere stated this person is going to concentrate on our enforcement efforts and in the interim capacity at least provide staff support with a concentration to the NET team.

Mayor Guinta asked for clarification what's the name of the position?

Mr. LaFreniere replied it's currently carried in our complement as a Housing Inspector position. We have advertised and interviewed with language in the description that provides us with the flexibility as using it as an enforcement position.

Alderman Gatsas stated you said you had some complaints in here about animals and what that might be.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we had a few different complaints...one resident had 40 cats and several dogs and neighbors were complaining about the smell and I know that Building, Health and Animal Control were dealing with that...that was on-going when the complaint came in and they've continued to do that investigation. I know Health is here but I don't know where that is at this point but that is something that those three departments are dealing with exclusively.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you turned it over to the Animal Control Officer.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we didn't turn it over they were already involved when we received the complaint. We had a rooster that was in Ward 7 that was taken by Animal Control...those are the two that stick out in my mind involving animals.

Alderman Osborne stated you have down here illegal businesses can you elaborate a little bit on that one...what do you mean by illegal businesses.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated the complaints come in as typically the jargon used by "us" are illegal businesses. We've had businesses operating without a license and those businesses were fined. We've had businesses that were operating without occupancy permits and I know those investigations...this one particular site is still being inspected and the Fire Department as well as the Building Department are working with them on getting that into compliance. But, typically it's people that maybe run an auto repair shop out of their garage at the house or something like that.

Alderman O'Neil asked how are we tracking...you get a call or somehow you're communicated with either through the website or a call...how are we tracking the initial visit by the team and then the follow-up...we probably don't have a software system set up for it.

Deputy Clerk Normand replied e-mail typically. What happens is we get all of the complaints that come in through the website...the complaints are directed to our office, then I get it into a list, get it out to the group of the NET team and then we typically decide about 10 places that we would go on a given day and as far as follow-up goes the department's will e-mail me as they've done certain things whether it's Building sending a letter giving them a deadline or Health sending an e-mail that they've cleared the property or whatever. The only thing I didn't have on this list tonight which I regret because I didn't get all of the information in time was how many citations were issued since the end of September...it's been a little over two months, two-and-a-half months that NET has even existed.

Alderman O'Neil asked have you had any discussion with the Info Systems people. I know in the past they've created some reports, specialty reports because it sounds like this whole thing falls back on you to do all of the tracking to make sure all of the departments follow-up on what they're supposed to do and the only way you can do that is you've got to pull a file out and look and see and make notes for yourself...have you had any discussions on that.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated I had a discussion with one of the individuals at Info Systems. The way the website works now is it drops it into an Excel sheet which is nearly impossible to read and for a variety of reasons they didn't have anything that would work otherwise. So, we have to take that information, lay all the sheets out on a table and then extract the information and put it into another list.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that something that's on going though to look at ways to not only receive the information but track it?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied I think Info's looked and I know the Mayor's office is aware of it and have spoken, I think, to Info.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just wan to reiterate to all the departments involved that this may be the single most important project we have going on in the City right now and I hope everybody's doing their job and nobody's dropping the ball and I'll be honest, Matt, I'm not looking for you to be dropping any names but if somebody's not doing their job I certainly want to know it and I'll hold that department head accountable. So, thank you.

Alderman Osborne asked is there any way the Aldermen can get complaints in each ward, 6, 5, 11, 10...is there any breakdown we can get actually what these complaints were?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied I can give you the addresses. The only thing I'm not comfortable giving out at this point are the ones that haven't been investigated yet but all of the ones that we've dealt with.

Alderman Osborne stated that will be fine.

Alderman Roy stated Matt when you look at...you've been in operation now for a couple of months...has anyone tracked the man hours that have been put into this?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied I know the departments...we talked about that after Alderman Duval brought it up several times and I don't have those hours with me but we did bring it up as a group and I know that the departments were going to tally it...the Mayor also asked the same question and my response to him and I wasn't sure who was on salary and who was hourly so I'm not sure...I know it doesn't affect man hours but as far as what the salary costs are. I know the departments, the individuals are keeping track of that so we can get a report the next meeting.

Alderman Roy stated I would like to see that report. One of the things that's been bantered around this Board for over two years now is that Solid waste Compliance Officer. I want it to be one of the most effective positions in the City. It seems like it's a very needed position in the City but is there when you look at a position like that is there more teeth that we can put into it, maybe broaden it to a NET team member full-time with solid waste background or is there anything you'd recommend.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated as I said earlier the recommendation...as far as funding goes, if funding is not available for that position everyone as a group believes that that's the single most important need at this point from NET's perspective. If funding is not available...I

know the position was allocated in the Highway budget but I don't know if funding was and as I mentioned earlier there are options out there, there may be options out there with grants through...there's 8 different grants that were identified by Dennis Hebert so if the Board choose to go that route with grant funding for that then I think there would have to be a nexus between NET and that position in order for the funds to go that way but I'm not any more well versed in that.

Alderman Roy stated I would like to see the citations...how many of them written, what's been collected and what they were written for. One of the conversations regarding the Solid Waste Compliance Officer was making that almost like an enterprise position. You go out, you get the job done, you clean it up, you write citations and you get paid out of that. So, that's one of the things I'd like to see how effective the NET team has been in funding some of those man hours that they've been out there.

Alderman Lopez stated for the public...Matt, what is your job right now?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied Deputy Clerk in the City Clerk's office.

Alderman Lopez asked what are you responsible for?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied all of the business licensing for the City, the alarm registrations, taxicabs, security of the facility.

Alderman Lopez stated you've been given this extra job on NET as coordinating for the entire City and you have put in a lot of hours in and I'm sure that's going to show well beyond seeing you outside at eight o'clock, nine o'clock at night doing things so I want to commend you for doing a good job and maybe that is the solution that Alderman Roy has on the Compliance Officer that this person should be in charge of NET also because you do have a full-time job in the City Clerk's office that could be suffering at the same time as doing this but this is more important at this stage of the game. So, I just wanted the public to know what your job was.

Alderman Smith stated as everyone knows the pictures that were shown are in my ward (10) and in Hank Thibault's ward (11) it's actually Granite Street. I went around my ward today and I picked up nine extreme violations...nine extreme violations and then three or four were called in...I'm meeting with Leon LaFreniere tomorrow. I would think, my colleagues, we have to do something about it. This is not an isolated ward case, it's all over the City and it's about time that we help out the homeowners and so forth to clean up. The homeowners should communicate with each other if somebody has trash out there. Like I said earlier I had the Highway Department come over and pick up some garbage and junk on West Street. The next day the same and different stuff was out from a different floor. They were over there on West Street three times in the space of four days and that's a cost to the Highway

Department, it's a cost to the program and it's a cost to the homeowners and I would ask everybody here to really consider the Compliance Officer...I know it's a cost, it hasn't been funded but we have to do something. We can't pat each other on the back...this is an on-going problem. I'll even give it...131 Parker Street...this has been going on for five years and I don't want to mention Matthew...everybody knows about Matthew...22 years it's been going on with no results. We have to do something. Finally, we should step up to the plate and do it.

Alderman Roy inquired as to the status of vacancy savings.

Mr. Sherman replied we're still working on it.

- 12.** Communication from Leslee Stewart, Vice Chairman of the Board of School Committee, advising of the Board's voted to reinstate four SRO's in the middle schools and requesting the City provide 50% of the funding for the 2006-2007 school year.

Alderman O'Neil moved for discussion. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I missed it in the request is there a dollar amount.

Mayor Guinta stated I think it was \$157,000, \$156,000...they were asking half of that.

Alderman O'Neil stated if that is the request have we identified on our side a funding source.

Mayor Guinta stated I have not.

Alderman O'Neil stated if we do not take action tonight will there be SRO's in the schools right after the first of the year.

Mayor Guinta replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil reiterated whether we take action or not.

Mayor Guinta stated that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked can you enlighten me then on how this is going to play out?

Mayor Guinta stated at the School Board meeting I want to say in November we had talked about the issue and what I had suggested is that because this was clearly important to this Board and to the community at large that there be a vote taken on putting the SRO's back into the schools with the caveat that the funding issue would be resolved later. The motion included that whether or not funding comes from this Board the SRO's would still move

forward and Vice-Chair Stewart, I believe, commented in the paper saying regardless of whatever vote happens this evening the SRO's will still be in the schools in January. They are essentially asking us if we would consider paying half of what the remainder of the fees, the chargeback would be.

Alderman O'Neil stated so at the first of the year there is a source of funding for the School district to pay a chargeback to the Police Department.

Mayor Guinta stated they've identified at least...the Administration has to me potential sources of funding. Whether it would be potential savings in the salary line item, potential energy savings based on savings from PSNH rates or other unused funds in their budget. I'm not sure if they full one hundred percent understand where the money is going to come from but I feel fairly confident that at the end of the day they're going to have the money.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we're being asked to support putting the SRO's in the schools.

Mayor Guinta stated no we're being asked to fund half of their cost which would be...

Alderman O'Neil stated then I go back to where is our source of funding.

Mayor Guinta stated I have not identified a source of funding on this side of the equator.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we saying then that theoretically the School District is going to pick up the first three months and then we're going to be on the hook for the last three months?

Mayor Guinta replied the SRO's are going into the schools and they will be paid for by the School Board they're asking that we supplement half of that cost. If we do not they are going to find a way to pay it.

Alderman Gatsas stated in reference to where they're going to find their funds I think that they were pretty clear in one of their meetings that they had found an additional \$860,000 in the salary line because they had more retirees than what they expected so I know that I was one of the advocates to make sure that whether the funding came from the City side or the School side that the SRO's would be in place. I just can't believe that it's taken this long to get them back into place and I would think that the funding certainly if they were having the same hardships on their budget that we're having here maybe I could understand the \$78,000 pitching to us but when they find \$860,000 in one line which is better than what any of us can find here I would think that that's something that they would have put them in place already and not waited until January.



Mayor Guinta stated but part of it is more scheduling issues than anything else. When they had notified the Police Department that they were not going to be utilizing the SRO's and then they reversed that decision I think several months later it takes some time for the officers on the Police side to be identified to get back to the schools. Rick Reilly would know probably better than any of us but one of the SRO's was moving on to a different field so that's part of the impact. So, I wouldn't say it's solely the School District's decision-making in that it's being delayed. There were logistic issues that played into it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would think that the \$860,000 they found...

Mayor Guinta stated that I agree with.

Alderman Gatsas stated probably they shouldn't be coming back to this Board looking for additional funding for them.

Alderman Duval stated a couple of questions just to clarify...the \$156,000 approximately...that number that was given. Is that a discounted number from the City side to the School District side?

Mayor Guinta stated there are 7 SRO's I believe and the Chief can correct me if I'm wrong...a chargeback and of the 7 we bill 4 of them at a first-year officer rate. So, we are already supplementing a portion. None of the SRO's are first-year officers but that's the bill they're getting for 4 of the 7 so we are supplementing part of the cost.

Alderman Duval stated so we're subsidizing part of the cost already. The number allocated was for funding the SRO's starting in October so now that number is really less isn't it if we're not going to be hiring the positions until January there's already been a reduction there.

Mayor Guinta stated you may be right but I'd have to double check before I could say that with certainty...that might have been as of November 1<sup>st</sup> but I'd have to check with the School District.

Alderman Long stated the \$156,000 is as of 10/16/2006. According to the October 10<sup>th</sup> minutes. How many SRO's are currently active?

Mayor Guinta replied three.

Alderman Long stated we're looking for them to start in January.

Mayor Guinta stated we have three now we'd be activating an additional four in the beginning of January.

Alderman Long stated also in those October 10<sup>th</sup> minutes the availability of 4 SRO's was in question also.

Mayor Guinta stated at that time but we talked to Rick Reilly and we have the 4 for January.

Alderman Long stated with respect to the financing we don't know what the number is...it's not half of \$156,000, definitely not.

Mayor Guinta stated probably closer to \$60,000 roughly on our side.

Alderman Osborne asked was this considered in their '06 budget in the first place?

Mayor Guinta replied I don't know the answer to that one.

Alderman Osborne stated then they backed off on it. It was there but they backed off for some reason because they were short someplace else or any of that type of this. Was this considered by them in the first place...they seemed to have them there before.

Mayor Guinta stated I know they were at least in their request.

Alderman Osborne stated they make their own budget, we give them the money, they make their own budget right.

Mayor Guinta stated they're responsible for...once we allocate the funds, once we appropriate the funds it's up to the School District as to how to allocate them.

Alderman Osborne stated exactly so I was just wondering if they did have that figure and all of a sudden they're backing down on it and asking us for half now.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to put some things into perspective. First of all the Chief of Police has the money in his budget to put these officers there...that's number one. The second is it's a chargeback but it becomes a revenue for the Police Department and the issue among the School Board members who I've talked to a couple today is they have not completed negotiations with the Police Department as to the cost of the officers in the schools. They don't mind paying for the officers that are in the schools that's not the issue and it's a revenue side to the Police Department. I think they have to talk about when the officer is out of the schools and look at accountability number one. Now, the Chief is accountable for his officers we understand that. When an officer is in the schools and he leaves to go investigate something he would do that anyway that's their argument.

He would still investigate even if the officer wasn't in school and there was a problem with a kid he would still investigate. So, they haven't negotiated that particular item. So, let's say for argument if it's \$130,000 at this stage of the game and they can negotiate something and

the revenue that was accounted in the Police Department's budget could be less than what they counted on being charged back from the schools that would be a minus to their budget and then at the end of the year Randy would do like Kevin did...calculate all of the revenue and if the revenue wasn't there then he'd make that up in the Rainy Day fund. I don't think it's the case, it's just a simple process that they have an argument as to if the officer is in the school 8 hours a day they don't mind paying it but if he's not some School Board members feel that they should not pay it. So, I just want to make sure that everybody understands that the money is there for the officers to be in the schools and everybody wants them in the schools, they're going to go to school and I think they have to sit down and negotiate some facts with the Police Department and come up with a revenue.

Alderman Shea just to answer Alderman Osborne my understanding was that the School did not include the SRO's in their budget, they eliminated it, however, as indicated it was in the Police budget...it's a chargeback. My point in discussing this is in listening to Mrs. DeFrancis who's the Finance Officer she gave a background as far as how much money is available in terms of assets and liabilities and at this stage they did not hire certain people to serve certain needs but they hired consultants and that resulted in savings in the salary line but it resulted of course in additional expenditures in the other line item which would be consultant but my understanding is that they are certainly operating at this particular date...December 19<sup>th</sup>....at a profit or at a surplus and therefore I don't think it's incumbent upon us to supply them with the necessary funding. I think that if in fact at the end of the year they don't return money and that's going to be an anomaly because they always return money I think that they have enough resources available but I do go along with Alderman Lopez. It is a critical issue because there is a discussion and a very serious discussion about paying for giving chargeback funding for services that aren't being rendered and there has been instances where SRO's have left buildings and gone to fires and other kinds of emergencies but have still billed the School for those particular services and I don't think members of the District are in agreement that they should be paying for services not being rendered more so than anyone here should be paying for services not being rendered at City government. Your Honor, you may have a response to that.

Mayor Guinta stated I would just boil it down to two points. First of all, I think the policy decision before this Board is do we in this instance and possibly in future instances elect to further subsidize payments that the School District as a matter of policy have decided they'd like to implement...that's decision number one. The second issue with respect to SRO's being specifically in a school...what I had hoped would happen and maybe it hasn't happened completely yet is for an education process to occur between the Police Department and the School Board. The nature of an SRO is essentially a police officer inside the school. That office from time-to-time because of the investigations that are identified as a result of having an officer in the school maybe outside of the school...almost half of the juvenile investigations in this City occur or are created as a matter of coming from the SRO's. So, part of their job is going to take them outside of the schools. I think to address what you

mentioned if there is an emergency or critical need in the geographic area in the City and an SRO happens to be in that school and they respond I believe that was the intention to try to address that. The intention by the Police Department to address that was to reduce the chargeback which is why four of the SRO's are charged at a first-year officer level rather than at higher. If there is a further discussion that needs to occur I have no objection to that but I think that those issues have been contemplated by the Police Department and have tried to be resolved.

Alderman Shea stated I think there has to be a discussion before the SRO's take over as far as what their responsibilities and duties might be.

Mayor Guinta stated I would agree and I have encouraged the School to do that.

Alderman Shea stated I don't think that's been taking place and I think that it's kind of a revolving situation where it's like you may be needed here you may be needed there but there has to be...I know that there can't be an absolute but I think that there has to be some sort of clarification as to why our SRO's are in the building and what are their responsibilities while in the building and this has to be done before payment is being made to them.

Mayor Guinta stated I would agree and I do believe...at least I have been told as recently as a couple of weeks ago by Assistant Superintendent Bass that conversation at least with the administration is occurring with the Police Department. At least at the last School Board meeting they have not responded back to the full School Board but I believe at least as what I've been told two weeks ago that that discussion is occurring.

Alderman DeVries stated I think the important piece we need to all keep track of is the SRO's are an important component of our Community Policing program and that's why we advocated for the School Board to move along and get them back into the schools. I think we've heard that succinctly from Police Department and Youth Services and others. I guess the one piece that I still see some confusion on is this is not an expense that we have to pay out to the School District it is clearly a revenue that will be a shortfall in the Police Department. If at the end of year there is not at least say seventy or eighty thousand dollar surplus coming back to the City would we be eligible for the Rainy Day fund to supplement this shortfall of revenue and that would be a Finance question.

Mr. Sherman stated you're allowed to tap into the Rainy Day fund if (1) we have a deficit which looks at both the expense side and the revenue side and (2) if that deficit is caused by a shortfall in revenues. So, if everything else comes out zero and there is a shortfall in revenue over at the Police Department and that's what causes the deficit then yes we can tap into the Rainy Day fund.

Alderman DeVries stated so to follow-up on that I don't know that there's any policy decisions that we need to make this evening. I think we need to encourage the School Department to move along with the SRO's and worry about this at the end of the budget year.

Mayor Guinta stated I wouldn't object to that...I would require a motion.

Alderman Shea moved to encourage the School Department to move along with the SRO's and wait till the end of the budget year. Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I've had some discussions with School Board members and I have to agree with them...that's not a pool for the Police Department to pull when they want to. In my opinion, it's a contract and they are agreeing to provide police officers at the schools. If those SRO's are not at the schools somebody still has to do investigations of crimes involving the students there. So, it's my opinion as being from the City side and side of the Police Department that those officers should be in that school as often as possible and I don't necessarily buy that they go out to do 20 hours-a-week doing investigations, I don't think that's necessary in my opinion. But, I think the department has to address that because if there are not SRO's in those schools the department still has to do those investigations somehow, correct?

Mayor Guinta stated yes however you've seen that the crime and the number of juvenile investigations as a result of the SRO's not being in the schools so they're not being generated in the first place. I think last year there was close to...just under 1,500 investigations...almost 730 of which came from the SRO's. Right now, we're on a track if we had 7 SRO's to meet that number but with the three we're not meeting the number. And, again, I don't disagree with you but this is a discussion that should be happening between the School Administration and the Police Department. And, I completely support that.

Alderman O'Neil asked why isn't that a done deal yet? This thing has dragged on forever...the two parties have got to sit down and get this done...they've had two meetings before the full School Board that I've watched on TV and, your Honor, I'm not blaming you but you're telling me tonight it's still not clear. I've got to say this...John (Chief Jaskolka), you guys have got to get together get this done. The public wants SRO's in the middle schools...that's what they expect and it sounds like it's bureaucracy.

Mayor Guinta stated I think that I have been very clear, I think every member of this Board has been very clear. We have talked about this in this City for months. I think we all agree that the SRO's should be in the schools and as quickly as possible. We have received a response from the administration and from the School Board members that they agree, however, the one identifiable obstacle is an agreement between the School Board/Administration and the Police Department. I can tell you that I have first-hand

knowledge of it that both sides are telling me they're working toward each other. But, the bottom line is the School District is a client, they've got to drive the us here and I've asked them on several occasions to do so.

Alderman O'Neil interjected it has to get done and it's gone on...as far as I'm concerned it's gone on too long.

Mayor Guinta stated I completely agree with you.

Alderman Roy stated one of the problem I have stepping back and looking at this whole process is it's almost like the School Board and some members of this Board are looking at the SRO's as security officers...they get to their job, they punch in, they protect the school and then they leave. You're talking about a dynamic position where they're a police officer with a location or as I look at it almost a substation of that school. So, if they leave for investigations they're based on crimes that happen either by a member of that school or upon a school student so I don't have a problem with them leaving the schools and it seems like that's a major problem with the School Board...we're not providing security, we're providing a Resource Officer and that's where I think the major disconnect is. If they're out investigating a crime that had something to do with that school if they're out of the school 30 hours so be it it will solve the problem in that school.

Alderman Garrity interjected...move the question, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated I've had discussions with the Police Chief about that very issue and the School District has to determine what exactly it is that they want in this "contract" that has to be dictated by the School Board and then the administration has to fulfill that request. Again, I think in a unifying voice we as the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are asking them to expedite...I think that's fair to say and we support it and if they need our assistance we're happy to help but we'd like the administration to move forward as expeditiously as possible ironing out those details and I know.

Alderman O'Neil stated parliamentary question...so, the request tonight is not for funding.

Mayor Guinta stated their request is and I think the vote is essentially to receive and file at the moment and determine at year's end if there is a revenue shortfall. Do you want me to have the motion read?

Alderman Lopez replied no...may I.

Mayor Guinta stated I just want to get Alderman O'Neil's question answered first before I move onto another one. Could you read the motion please.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated essentially that was my understanding that the Board was taking no action other than to take it under advisement and review it as a shortfall in revenue at the end of the year.

Mayor Guinta stated I did recognize Alderman Gatsas and then I will got o a parliamentary question of Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess I don't disagree. We're coming onto Christmas break and then we're in January. Are we talking about Resource Officer's being in schools as soon as we get back from Christmas break...what is that timeline and I guess I'm down the street that Alderman O'Neil's on except for one little twist. I don't know why we are just charging an officer of first-year caliber if that's not what's there.

Mayor Guinta stated I think that was in order...it was a subsidy, a form of subsidy.

Alderman Gatsas stated but that subsidy's not been recognized by anybody so obviously we should be charging the till and if that's a revenue and if it's a revenue that's coming in that means maybe the Resource Officer's should be full-time in the schools and we should hire seven more to make sure the complement at the Police Department is what we're asking for because obviously the 215 isn't really 215 it's really 208 because they're in school virtually during the day.

Mayor Guinta stated I think that would be up to the Police Chief and the School District to finalize.

Alderman Gatsas asked when is our next meeting in January?

Mayor Guinta replied January 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would like to include in that motion if someone would take a friendly amendment to that motion...or I'll make another one right after it that some agreement comes back to this Board to tell us by January 2<sup>nd</sup> how the students in the middle schools are going to be protected.

Mayor Guinta stated we can request that of the School Administration to provide with a status by the second. I can issue that letter on behalf of the Board first thing in the morning.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe the Chief can report back to us if he's got a deal by the second if the School Board...but I think something's got to be done because the second is going to come and at that point we're only five months left before school's out.

Mayor Guinta stated I will send a letter to the School Administration first thing in the morning and ask them to have a response to us by the second.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we're making a mountain out of a mole hill because the School Board is negotiating...I think the appropriate thing would be to try to get an answer from the School Department by the 1<sup>st</sup> of February because the motion is saying we're not going to do anything until the end of the year but we need some type of understanding of the negotiations and the revenues that would be coming back after they take a vote over there and they make their agreement and that's where the issue is. The SRO's are going in the schools, it's just a matter of revenue and Randy just told told if we don't get the revenue and they hear that tonight...if they don't give us anything then it's going to come out of the Rainy Day fund so it's imperative that the Mayor's office as the School Board Chairman work with the people over there to get an answer by February 1<sup>st</sup> as to the solution with the Police Department so we know what they're going to be charged. So, I ask you your Honor to do that...you sit as the Chairman.

Mayor Guinta stated the request before us is to pay for half of the fee. If we don't the SRO's go into the schools in January and we receive a chargeback...that's a very simple issue. There's a larger issue about the relationship between a contract that needs to exist between the School District and the Police Department.

Alderman O'Neil stated with all due respect I'm not sitting here tonight convinced that there are going to be SRO's in the schools in January...you can't even get an agreement together. Forget the whole financial part of it...the two parties can't get together and get an agreement. So, I can't leave here tonight thinking there are SRO's in the schools...

Mayor Guinta interjected the only think I can tell you is what the administration conveys to me and what they convey to me is that they have met on more than one occasion with the department to iron this issue out. Again, based on the comments I will absolutely send a letter to the administration tomorrow asking for a clarification so that at least this Board is aware of the next time it meets on January 2<sup>nd</sup> 2007...if I have additional information prior to then I'll issue a communication to this Board.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is the day the kids go back to school, correct.

Mayor Guinta stated yes.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.



**13. Communications from the City Solicitor and Interim Finance Officer relative to the Manchester Employees Contributory Retirement System.**

Alderman Shea moved for discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated my concern is how much interest are we paying at this stage...that is really very critical because you win some in court and you lose some in court and I'm wondering if Randy or someone can tell us how much money we're paying in interest as this drags on.

Mr. Sherman stated we're actually not paying any interest at this point but they have...I believe they're over a \$1.5 million at this point so they're calculating interest I believe at 7.5% and they're assessing it all the way back to 2004.

Alderman Shea stated so basically the longer this drags out without a resolution the more costly it's going to become either for us or if we win they're going to be out whatever the amount is. Is that your understanding?

Mr. Sherman stated there are some components of the City that have made the payment and if you recall back in July I said that those dollars should be refunded to the City with interest versus the City making an additional payment the other direction. So, at the end of the day someone will owe someone some interest.

Alderman Shea stated the status of this at this time is that according to your letter you're going to try to meet with them but according to a letter we received I thought from them there is going to be court action I thought so there might be a little bit of confusion.

Mr. Sherman stated they need to file in court to preserve their rights. There are statutes of limitations on receivables and they need to just make that filing to preserve that. We would like to meet with them. They actually called on Friday...called Tom Clark on Friday and asked to meet and we thought it best to come to the Board first before we met with them. We had a Retirement Board meeting today and I expressed that to both Attorney Rich and the Trustees that after tonight's meeting we'd be more than happy to sit down and meet with them and discuss the issue if that's the Board's desire.

Alderman Shea asked how long...I don't know if I should ask you or Tom but how long can this persist without a decision being made so that finality is finally reached...how long do you envision it going on?

City Solicitor Clark replied the statute of limitations requires them to file in court within three years, so they have to file by December 29<sup>th</sup>. In speaking with Randy I believe he

wants to try and meet before then to see if it can be worked out. If not, they'll file and we'll move forward from there it doesn't mean that discussions will stop.

Alderman Shea stated from past precedents how long do you think this can go on. If we're being charged a pretty good amount of interest here...the longer it goes on the worse it becomes for us if we do tend to lose. Is it settled in a year or two years or six months?

City Solicitor Clark replied something of this nature could be done within a year maybe sooner. It depends on how the court system process is backed up.

Alderman Shea stated so we're perhaps look at '08 or '07.

City Solicitor Clark stated potentially yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is another case of it's been here month-after-month-month.

Alderman Shea is absolutely right. We're going to get together, they send a letter, we send a letter back...sit down and get this thing resolved. I can't understand why this has continued...sit down and resolve it. I'm sitting here very frustrated that this is two items in a row that parties can't sit down and resolve something. Get in a room, lock the door and fix it...we'll send a letter, they'll send a letter...back-and-forth is old...get it resolved.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't disagree. It's a little frustrating that the issue has been going on since 2004. I can tell you at this point the parties have two completely opposing positions. So, it sounds like because there is a deadline date looming at the end of this year we'll see if there's any substance to a meeting in December and it sounds like if there's not we'll at least have an update in January but unless all of a sudden in the next 15 days they can come to a miraculous turnaround I don't...

Alderman O'Neil stated I do agree with Alderman Shea. The longer this goes on and if we lose the taxpayers of this City are exposed. It's in their best interest to resolve this in my opinion.

Alderman Gatsas asked Randy have you looked into the Retirement Board's audited statements?

Mr. Sherman asked for which year, Alderman?

Alderman Gatsas replied 2004 and 2005.

Mr. Sherman replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked does it show a receivable of this amount...they continue to carry the receivable yes?

Mr. Sherman replied they continue to carry the receivable yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there any footnote to the receivable?

Mr. Sherman replied there is and it says that they cannot determine whether it will be collected or not. They mention that the City is contesting it so as far as its collectability they can't give an opinion on that.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about in 2004?

Mr. Sherman replied in 2004 no I don't believe that they had that same footnote on it because at that point they didn't think there was a contest.

Alderman Gatsas stated so in 2004 they didn't show it as a receivable but then the receivable appeared in 2005.

Mr. Sherman stated in 2004 they were carrying it as a receivable, they weren't carrying the same footnote.

Alderman Gatsas asked is the statement a qualified statement or is it a...

Mr. Sherman replied no it's unqualified I believe.

Alderman Gatsas asked do I see a shaking of a head yes or no back there? It's a qualified statement or an unqualified statement? It's an unqualified statement...can you tell me the difference, Mr. Sherman, between a qualified statement and an unqualified statement?

Mr. Sherman replied you have certain Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and if you follow all of those principles you get an unqualified statement. If there's an issue that the auditors have that they don't think something is properly stated and according to GAAP they will qualify your financial statements.

Alderman Gatsas stated so it's unqualified, so they don't have a problem with the receivable.

Mr. Sherman stated again from the first time that they put the receivable in they thought the City was going to pay the receivable. Now, that it's being contested by the City they now continue to carry the receivable, however, now they've got a footnote in there saying they don't know if it is collectible or not.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess just to get back to where Alderman O'Neil was...is that that qualified statement has been there since 2005 and the footnote's been there and nobody's done anything for it in almost a two-year period.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question for Tom Clark. You say that they have to file by December 29<sup>th</sup> and you plan on meeting before December 29<sup>th</sup> I presume.

Mr. Sherman stated yes I talked to them today and I have tomorrow and Friday available.

Alderman Lopez stated just for the sake of argument say you do come to a conclusion will that have to come back to the fill Board?

City Solicitor Clark replied it would depend on what the conclusion is. If it's a compromise with this agreement yes we'd come back to the Board.

Alderman Lopez stated if you didn't do that by the 20<sup>th</sup> would they still file?

City Solicitor Clark replied they may still file a Writ...they just have to get it into the court system...that's not an expensive item which they could withdraw at anytime.

Alderman Osborne stated I think what we're trying to do is reach some sort of a compromise...there's a statute of limitations and I think Randy Sherman and Tom Clark are trying to do such and I'd move that they sit down and kind of iron this out somehow and come back to us.

Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith stated back in May this group met...Kevin Buckley, Tom Clark, Scott Bassett from McGladrey & Pullen the City's outside auditor and it says that we're really in a position to finally resolve the dispute in a letter dated July 11<sup>th</sup> and I'm wondering why this is still going on. Now, this letter was dated July 11<sup>th</sup> and I know it came up in the Accounts Committee and it's still going on. So, these people met back on May 8<sup>th</sup> and then a letter from Randy Sherman to us on July 11<sup>th</sup> came up and we're in the same situation we are today and I can't understand it. Could you ask the Interim Finance Officer why that is still occurring?

Mr. Sherman replied I handed that letter out to the Board on July 11<sup>th</sup> and the Retirement Board got it that same day. They reviewed my letter and didn't respond back to the City until November...so, there's a 4-month lag/window in that period till they responded...that's when Tom Clark sent you that correspondence at the second meeting of November of the Board and now this is our response back. When they got back to us in November they pretty much came back and said okay we agree with your conclusion on that part, however, we've

got additional documents that we think still make our case so again it took a couple of weeks to go back and review those documents and now that's why I'm getting back to the Board saying I've reviewed those documents, however, I still hold my initial position.

Alderman Smith stated you mean to tell me that they did not get back to you for four months.

Mr. Sherman stated that's correct.

Alderman DeVries stated Randy I'm looking at your December 13' 2006 letter to us and in the final paragraph you're indicating you wanted to sit down and meet with them and you state that you believe that there are several different appropriate courses of action that could be discussed and I'm just wondering why you haven't given us any detail on that action. I don't know if you want to do it in confidentiality as opposed to in a public meeting but I think that we should be privileged to have some idea of what is going on in your mind when you make this kind of a statement.

Mr. Sherman stated that's part of...the fact that the letter was on a public agenda...Tom Clark and I have talked about...if you want to go into more detail we would ask that we recess to meet with counsel but I'm not really sure at this point that's a necessary step. What we'd really like to do is go back and meet with them, get the parties to sit down and try to hammer out the differences on this one. I agree it's gone back-and-forth and I've been working on it since May and I agree I think it's clearly gone on too long...have been patient...it's been over two years since they sent the first receivable out but I do think there are some areas that we can talk about and again resolve this.

Alderman DeVries certainly to take us back to where we started in this whole meeting as we start to accrue interest on this I think it's important that even if you need to do it in a confidential mode with us we have more detailed information for where you think you are going to be taking us and what the time span is going to be for getting resolution on this so we have an idea how much money is actually being expended as we go back-and-forth on this. I call the question.

Mayor Guinta asked does that require an action or is that a request?

Alderman DeVries replied it's a comment but we started with the comment that we're accruing interest...let's resolve this...give us some better details.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- 14.** Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, requesting extensions of CIP projects as listed.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there is an additional request of the 2005 CIP #811405, Security with a balance of \$6,355.93.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the requesting CIP project extensions. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

- 15.** Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:  
“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the B-2 (General Business) zoning district to include property currently zoned IND (Industrial) located on the south side of Gold Street east of the former Lawrence Branch of the B&M Railroad and including the following three lots Tax Map 875-14, 875-15, 875-16.”  
ought to pass.  
*(Aldermen Duval, Lopez, Garrity and Pinard recorded in favor; Alderman Gatsas opposed.)*  
*(Tabled 09/05/2006)*

This item remained tabled.

- 16.** Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:  
“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the R-3 (Urban Multi-family) zoning district to include property currently zoned R-1B (Single-family) located on a portion of Tax Map 691 Lot 143-1 that will be on the north side of a proposed Gold Street Bypass and adjacent to Bradley Street and the New St. Augustin’s Cemetery.”  
ought to pass.  
*(Aldermen Duval, Lopez, Garrity and Pinard recorded in favor; Alderman Gatsas opposed.)*  
*(Tabled 09/05/2006)*

This item remained tabled.

- 17.** Communication from Randy Sherman, Interim Finance Officer, requesting that approximately \$50,000.00 be set aside in Contingency due to the severance payout to the former Finance Officer.  
*(Tabled 11/28/06 pending filling of permanent Finance Officer position and review of other fund sources by Mayor.)*

This item remained tabled.

### **18. NEW BUSINESS**

Mayor Guinta called upon Juan Ayala...is leaving us to go back to the Hillsborough County of Corrections. He has been the City Hall Complex Security Officer for the better part of the

last year and we wanted to acknowledge the fact that you have served us well, we appreciate it and we wish you luck in your future endeavors.

Requests to approve extensions of septage agreements between the City of Manchester and the Towns of Litchfield and Plaistow.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson introduced both requested septage agreements to the Board noting both agreements are expiring December 31<sup>st</sup> and are looking for approval of those two items.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the extensions of septage agreements between the City of Manchester and the Towns of Litchfield and Plaistow. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.

City Solicitor Clark stated your Honor before you adjourn did you want to recess to meet with legal counsel?

Alderman Pinard moved to adjourn. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated your Honor, I was just going to ask you...I'm going back to the septage agreements...did we approve a 5-year or a 3-year one?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied it's a 3-year between...actually it says 5 or 3-year extension of agreement so it would be a 3-year extension unless the Board voted otherwise for the Town of Litchfield.

Mayor Guinta stated we're in the middle of a vote so you can get that clarification afterwards.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion to adjourn. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Gatsas gave Notice for Reconsideration of the approval of the extensions of the septage agreements with the Towns of Litchfield and Plaistow.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk